

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 14-16 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-4 and 6 are amended, claims 14-16 are added and claims 8, 9 and 11-13 are canceled. Support for the amended claims, and new claims, may be found in the original specification at, for example, page 20, line 16 to page 35, line 5. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claim Objection

Claim 4 was objected to for allegedly being in improper form. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection.

The Patent Office provides no foundation for the allegation of claim 4 being in improper form and only provides a conclusory statement. However, claim 4 is in proper form as it depends from a proper independent claim, includes every feature of the independent claim and further limits the independent claim. That is, claim 4 is directed to a document processing system that includes as one component the linking information device of claim 1. Claim 4 thus incorporates the device of claim 1 therein, and further limits the device of claim 1 by limiting the device's environment of use. This claim format is proper, for example as indicated in *Ex parte Porter*, 25 USPQ2d 1144 (BPAI 1992) (claim 6) and *Ex parte Blattner*, 2 USPQ2d 2047 (BPAI 1987) (claims 11 and 14).

As such, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-9 and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,872,569 ("Salgado"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Response to Arguments

The current claims allow a user to utilize information provided by a system that indicates, upon a user's request, what possible services are available. Thus, the user may use this information to create his/her own workflow from an existing workflow, thereby allowing the user to execute desired services via the workflow. Thus, the system, method and device are very interactive in allowing the user multiple possible workflows with the ability to execute each.

Claims 1, 2 and 3

Salgado merely discloses a job ticket programming that includes a server for storing capabilities and attributes of devices connected through a network. The Patent Office alleges that Salgado discloses a service list acquisition unit that acquires a service list in column 14, lines 10-48. However, Salgado merely discloses that an application server provides profiles of various devices that are available along with their capabilities/attributes. Capabilities are defined as the features that are available on the device, whether or not these features are enabled, and an attribute are defined as an enabled feature currently available.

In contrast, a service list in the claims is a list of services available that are provided by service processing devices, not merely individual features of a device. That is, knowing what services are available based on the service processing devices that are available is different from knowing individual features of devices. For example, a service list takes into consideration all the devices that are needed in order to execute a service and whether or not the devices needed to execute the service are available. However, merely knowing the features of individual devices, as disclosed in Salgado, does not provide the relationship of how these devices may or may not interact with other devices available and/or the services that are available from such interaction, as required in the present claims.

Further, Salgado merely discloses a user interface with a display screen for displaying a plurality of metaphor elements and an image element for connecting the metaphor elements that are compatible (see column 8, lines 3 to 19). The Patent Office alleges that Salgado discloses icons that are assigned to each device available in the system. The assignment allegedly not only relates to an icon to a device, but information attributable to each device such that the determination can be made on compatibility of different devices. However, nowhere does Salgado teach or suggest user interaction with the information on the display screen in starting the linking of the predetermined processings and/or the selection of the linking information, which provides interaction between the service processing devices, as required in the present claims. This interaction has the advantage of making workflow easy even when services constructing the workflow are changed or added.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 2 and 3, and dependent claims thereof, are patentable over the applied reference. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-7 and 14-16 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kevin K. Jones
Registration No. 56,809

JAO:KKJ/hs

Date: August 30, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461